Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/605,488	BURKE, THOMAS R.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Srirama Channavajjala	2166
All Participants: Status of Application: <u>Allowed</u>		
(1) <u>Srirama Channavajjala</u> .	(3)	
(2) Edwin A Skoch II, Reg.No. 50,483.	(4)	
Date of Interview:	Time: <u>1-30 PM</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	plicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 1-36 Prior art documents discussed:		
Hertzog et al. US Pub.No. 2003/0069874 and Smith et al. US	S Pub.No. 2002/0083008	
Part II.		•
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GE See Continuation Sheet	NERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	3 DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separadirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separadid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief sum 	The examiner will provide a written record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
	•	<u> </u>
de-		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)		

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

A telephone was made to applicant's representative Attorney, Edwin A Skoch II, Reg.No. 50,483 about the potential amendment to the claims 1,3,6,13-15,18, cancel claims: 2,4-5,7-8,10-12,16-17,19-36, amendment to the specification at page 22, paragraph [0066-0067], amendment to the drawings as filed on 2/28/2007 "replacement sheet" fig 15A" attached as markup drawing in order to allow the case. The representative agreed with the Examiner's proposal and authorization has given for an Examiner's Amendment.